

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OFFICIAL

JUN 23 2004

PATENT  
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10407/459IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Larry McAllister et al.

Serial No.: 09/690,289 Examiner: Aaron L. Enatsky

Filed: October 16, 2000 Group Art Unit: 3713

Title: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR AN ENHANCED GAMING  
DEVICE

Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION AND RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

This request for continued examination and amendment is responsive to the final Office Action of January 23, 2004, and is timely filed with a two-month extension.

CURRENT STATUS

Claims 1-87 are pending in the present application. Claims 3-5, 24-26, 45-47, and 66-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 13-20, 22-23, 25-26, 34-44, 46-47, 55-62, 64-65, 67-68, 76-83, and 85 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Marchini et al. (GB Patent No. 2,251,112). Claims 3, 24, 45, 66, and 86 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Marchini et al., and further in view of Nolte et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,165,070). Claims 4, 34-41, 46, and 67 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Marchini et al., and further in view of Bertram et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,796,389). Claims 21, 63, and 84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Marchini et al., and further in view of Wiltshire et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,409,602). Claim 87 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Marchini et al., and further in view of Franchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,770,553).

Atty Docket No.: 10407/459  
Serial No. 09/690,289

Claims 1, 3-5, 21, 22, 24-26, 42, 43, 45-47, 63, 64, 66-68, and 84 have been amended. No new claims have been added. No claims have been deleted. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims. Applicant respectfully contends that the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art.